DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 716 HE 002 344

AUTHOR	Carbone, Robert F.; Jenson, Oscar
TITLE	Non-Resident Students at State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE	7 Jan 71
NOTE	11p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Policy, *College Admission, *Nonresident Students, *State Universities, *Tuition

ABSTRACT

This report provides information on 2 issues related to the nonresident student: policies covering their admission and procedures for establishing tuition levels. Data were collected from a questionnaire distributed to 117 state universities and land-grant colleges. The survey focused on: quotas or limitations on admission of nonresidents; nonresident admissions policies as a technique for ensuring diversity in university student bodies; tuition differentials for resident and nonresident students; the basis for determining tuition differentials; and the body or agency responsible for determining tuition differentials. Data gleaned from the 98 responding institutions are discussed and tabulated. It was found that 3 out of 5 responding major public universities find it unnecessary to place tight controls on admission of nonresidents; all institutions work under the assumption that a mix of students is beneficial to the educational environment, although few appear to have a systematic approach to nonresident admissions or to select their students with an eye toward achieving a more desirable mix; the differential between resident and nonresident tuition is substantial in all parts of the country; and nonresidents, more than their fellow students, are coming under increasing pressure. (JS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED052716

NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS AT STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

by
Robert F. Carbone, assisted by Oscar Jensen

Non-resident students at the nation's major state universities have become the subjects of increased concern in higher education. This report provides information on two issues related to the non-resident student--policies covering their admission and procedures for establishing tuition levels.

It is not surprising that non-resident students are under scrutiny. For one thing, they are relatively easy to identify as a group. Beyond that, they figure significantly in the current problems of higher education--continued rise in educational costs, increased demand for educational opportunities, and student unrest that has plagued administrators, worried governing boards, and infuriated legislators.

Among the questions that result are: Why should any state subsidize the education of non-residents? Why should non-residents be admitted when some resident students are denied admission? Why do so many out-of-state students make the headlines when there is trouble on campus? To further complicate the matter, it has been alleged that some institutions use admission criteria that discriminate unfairly against certain non-resident students.

HE002344

Dr. Carbone is Dean of the College of Education, University of Maryland
Mr. Jensen is an advanced graduate student in higher education in the College of Education

Answers to these questions and allegations are hard to find because very little specific information is available. This dearth of information prompted a survey of the 117 state universities and land-grant colleges holding membership in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC).

The survey focused on five specific areas:

1. Quotas or limitations on the admission of non-resident students.
2. Non-resident admissions policies as a technique for insuring diversity in university student bodies.
3. Tuition differentials for resident and non-resident students.
4. The basis for determining differential tuition.
5. The body or agency that determines tuition differentials.

Data was collected from a questionnaire distributed by the NASULGC Office of Research and Information. A total of 98 of the 117 member institutions responded to the survey (84.5%). The data gleaned from these responses provide a general picture of the non-resident student admissions and tuition situation in member institutions.

Admission Quotas

Of the 98 responding institutions, 58 (60%) indicated they have no limits or quotas restricting the number or percent of non-resident students admitted or enrolled. Forty institutions utilize some quota or limitation on non-resident enrollment or admissions. There is little uniformity or pattern in the form these limitations take.

Six institutions said they have a quota but did not specify its dimensions. Three base their quota on the availability of facilities or student places. Two reported that they admit a specific number of non-residents each year, while the remainder have some established percentage quota.

The percentage quota for admitting new freshman students varies from five percent in one institution to 33 percent in another. The specific percentages are as follows:

University of Mississippi	5%
University of Connecticut	10% 1/
Florida (State System)	10% 1/
University of Oregon	12½%
Tennessee A & I	15%
Cornell University	15-20%
University of Kentucky	20% 2/
Kentucky State	20%
University of Maine	20%
Ohio State	20%
Miami (Ohio)	20%
University of Rhode Island	20%
University of Maryland	20% 3/
West Virginia University	20-25%
University of Delaware	25%
Purdue University	25%
University of Michigan	25%
Wayne State University	25%
University of Wyoming	30%
Delaware State	33%

1/ The percentage of the University of Florida is seven percent for new freshmen and 12 percent for all undergraduate students.

2/ To be reduced to 15 percent.

3/ To be lowered to 14 percent in 1971-72.

In some cases, limits are placed on the total number of all undergraduates admitted. The percentage quotas in this category:

Florida A & M	10%
Pennsylvania State	10%
University of Georgia System	15%
University of North Carolina	15%
University of Idaho	20%
V P I	20%
University of Wisconsin	25% 1/
University of Vermont	40%
University of Virginia	45%

Kent State University reported that it limits ron-resident enrollments to 20% of all students in the University. Only one institution reported a percentage limitation on the number of non-resident graduate students it could admit (University of North Carolina--15 percent).

Few institutions reported specific limitations covering foreign students. The University of Florida limits foreign students admitted to 3 percent and the University of North Carolina sets a 15 percent quota. Purdue holds its enrollment of foreign students to 1,000 during any given year and Penn State includes foreign students in the 10 percent limitation on all undergraduate students enrolled.

Two institutions annually establish numerical limits on the number of non-residents enrolled. The University of Colorado currently enrolls 1,000 non-resident freshmen and accepts 650 non-resident transfer students each year. In 1970, Oregon State admitted 400 non-resident freshmen and a total of 1,200 non-resident undergraduates and 2,200 non-resident graduate students.

1/ To be lowered to 15 percent in 1971-72. In addition to the above quota, up to three percent of all undergraduates may be comprised of children of alumni who are non-residents.

The data suggests that the reasons for establishing limits on the enrollment of non-resident students must be unique to each institution. No single rationale could easily explain the diversity and the range of quotas employed. Obviously, proximity is an important factor for those institutions located near state boundaries or in the vicinity of states that have traditionally exported large numbers of students. The national reputation of an institution or its specialized nature often justifies the need to limit non-resident enrollments. The important point, however, is that almost two-thirds of major public universities have found it neither necessary nor desirable to utilize quotas on the admission of non-residents.

Student Body Diversity

Skeptics might wonder why a state-supported university should enroll students from another state. The most obvious reason offered is the need to provide diversity in the student body. It is thought that students benefit from having daily contact with those from other states where different modes of thought and different cultural backgrounds may be prevalent.

This notion prompted a question in the survey to determine whether universities used the admission process as a method for insuring this diversity of student population. Only five of the 98 institutions that responded indicated any efforts to do this.

The University of Michigan reported it attempts to keep a regional balance and Iowa State University said it makes a somewhat "unsystematic" attempt to do this. Both State University of New York-Albany and Washington State University try to provide a diversified foreign student

enrollment but did not report doing this for students from this country. Only Massachusetts Institute of Technology reported formal recruitment activities designed to produce some kind of regional balance in its student population.

Most institutions do not consider "place of residence" in making admission decisions on non-resident students. While this reflects a devotion to certain academic ideals, it is in sharp contrast to the alleged desirability of enrolling students with diverse cultural and geographic backgrounds. The failure to use admissions as a means of insuring diversity could well be used by some as an argument for further limiting enrollment of non-resident students, a prospect of doubtful benefit to higher education.

Tuition Differentials

An earlier report from the NASULGC Office of Research and Information ("Joint Report on 1970-71 Student Charges from AASCU and NASULGC." October 1970) provided detailed tuition figures for resident and non-resident students in public colleges and universities. The new non-resident survey yielded some information in this regard also. The institutions were asked to indicate their 1970-71 academic tuition and fees for resident and non-resident undergraduate and graduate students (excluding professional school students). The intent was to demonstrate both national and regional averages illustrating the difference between tuition charges for resident students and those assessed non-residents.

The average differentials for the 98 institutions that responded are as follows:

Resident Undergraduate Students..... $ 470.00
Non-resident Undergraduate Students..... $1,119.00

Resident Graduate Students..... $ 517.00
Non-resident Graduate Students..... $1,057.00[1/]

When the tuition levels reported were categorized regionally, some interesting variations appeared. For the purposes of this analysis, the institutions were grouped according to the regional accrediting association under which they operate. These data are reported below.

------AVERAGE TUITION CHARGES BY REGION - FALL 1970------

REGION	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE	
	RESIDENT	NON-RESIDENT	RESIDENT	NON-RESIDENT
New England*	$505	$1,322	$495	$1,040
Middle States	456	900	704	892
Southern	467	962	514	904
Western	454	1,568	464	1,568
Northwest	404	1,084	409	889
North Central	420	1,093	431	1,083

Responses to this question on tuition charges required that in some cases they be converted to a common scale (i.e., semester hours) or that a per-credit-hour charge be calculated at an average "normal load" rate of 30 semester hours per year for undergraduate and 20 semester hours per year for graduate students. The data indicates that non-residents pay from two to three times the tuition charged residents. The differential between resident and non-resident tuition is greatest in the Western region and smallest in the Middle States. These findings are generally in agreement with those of the earlier NASULGC study.

[1/] The mean difference between resident and non-resident undergraduate students is 2.38 and the mean difference between resident and non-resident graduate students is 2.04.

* Excluding MIT, which reported a standard tuition of $2,580 for all students.

The Basis for Differential Tuition

Institutions contacted in this survey were asked to indicate how they determined the differential between resident and non-resident tuition. They were asked whether non-resident tuition covered full cost of instruction or a percent of the instructional costs.

The wording of the question apparently led a number of respondents to misunderstand or misinterpret it. Only 65 of the institutions provided information regarding the basis upon which non-resident tuition is calculated.

Of this number, 20 institutions reported that non-resident tuition is pegged to cover the full cost of instruction. Thirty institutions set their non-resident tuition to cover a given percentage of instructional costs. Three institutions now charging non-residents a percentage of instructional costs are moving toward a policy of assessing full cost of instruction to non-residents. Apparently, the specific percentage utilized by these institutions varies from year to year. The only information in this regard came from four institutions that indicated they pegged non-resident tuition at 75 percent of instructional costs.

In some states, institutions determine the level of non-resident fees after consultation with universities in neighboring states or with universities of a similar character. This practice was reported by seven universities.

Three universities assess non-residents a specific flat rate. One sets the rate at $200 per semester, another at $300, and the third did not specify the amount. Three universities set the rate at three times resident tuition, while another charges four times resident tuition. Finally, one university reported it charges non-resident students an amount equal to the state appropriation for each resident student.

Establishing Non-resident Tuition

The authority to establish the level of student fees appears to be clearly lodged in the hands of institutional governing boards. The survey asked the institutional respondents to indicate who made the final decision in this regard.

In 72 of the responding institutions, the governing board is responsible for setting the tuition levels. In one institution, this authority is delegated to the administration and in another state to the coordinating agency for higher education. Seventeen respondents said the state legislature is the ultimate determiner of tuition levels. Seven institutions that returned the survey did not respond to this question.

SUMMARY

Despite the mobility and affluence of present-day society, three out of five responding major public universities find it unnecessary to place tight controls on the admission of non-resident students. This is a significant fact when considered in light of current enrollments. Perhaps half a million non-residents now attend public colleges and universities, large numbers of them at institutions covered by this survey.

It can be said that all institutions of higher education welcome students from other states, under the assumption that a mix of students is beneficial to the educational environment. Even the institutions that place a quota or other restriction on non-resident enrollments have quite liberal policies--permitting from 20 percent to 45 percent non-resident enrollment.

Unfortunately, few universities appear to have a systematic approach to non-resident admissions and almost none select these students with an eye toward achieving a more desirable mix. If their student populations are diverse, it is largely due to chance. As a result, the basic argument for welcoming out-of-state students to a public institution is weakened. This is a matter which might well receive greater attention from institutional admissions committees in the future.

The differential between resident and non-resident tuition is substantial in all parts of the country but some regional variations are revealed. A surprisingly large number of institutions report that non-residents are required to pay the full cost of instruction. About half of the institutions, however, charge non-residents some percentage of instructional costs. There does appear to be a slight trend toward charging full costs, undoubtedly a result of pressures on state budgets. In most cases, institutional governing boards determine tuition levels and thus set the difference in student fees.

Non-resident students, more so than their fellow students from within the state, are coming under increasing pressure. The cost of an education continues to rise and a greater share of this cost is being shifted to the student. The non-resident often is expected to pay a greater portion of these costs than is the resident. Also, limits

on the number of non-residents to be admitted to an institution are imposed on top of more demanding admission requirements. The squeeze that results could seriously alter the mix of students in our major public universities.

These are matters that demand greater attention by both administrators and faculty members. A first step might be to see that institutional admissions procedures insure student populations that are more representative of the entire nation. A more defensible rationale for admitting non-residents in the first place would undoubtedly help governing boards and the general public see the folly of restrictive quotas and excessive tuition charges for non-resident students.

7/1/71

END

DEPT.OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION
ERIC
DATE FILMED

11 4 71